



218

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-13701-2024
DATE OF DECISION: 11.07.2024**

**TAJINDER SINGH ALIAS TEJINDER SINGH
...PETITIONER**

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA ... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr.P.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. B.S.Virk, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C., has been invoked for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 435, dated 01.12.2023, under Sections 15/27-A and 29 of The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Pehowa, District Kurukshetra.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused, the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused in the present case. The allegations against the present petitioner are that he had transferred Rs. 50,000/- at behest of his father namely Partap Singh, which was handed over to co-accused-Gursewak Singh @ Gabi. It is further asserted that recovery of 85 Kilogram of doda post has been effected by the investigating agency from co-accused-Gursewak Singh @Gabi and Narsi Singh @ Kala.



CRM-M-13701-2024

-2-

Except this, no incriminating material coming forth from the prosecution against the present petitioner. The petitioner has been in custody since 03.12.2023. He further seeks parity, rather being on better footing submits that his father Partap Singh has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 22.04.2024 passed in CRM-M-54-2024.

3. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. According to which, the petitioner is behind bars for last 7 months and 4 days. He seeks dismissal of the petition stating that the recovery effected is commercial in nature and there is direct evidence against the present petitioner in the form of disclosure statement made by co-accused Gursewak Singh @ Gabi to say that the petitioner has paid Rs. 50,000/- against purchase of 85 kg of doda post. He submits that charges are yet to be framed and none of the prosecuted witness has been examined till date.

4. Be that as it may, learned State Counsl controvert the facts that investigation is complete and no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and even the petitioner was not present at the alleged place of occurrence i.e. dhaba. This fact cannot be ignored which corroborates the argument raised by counsel for the petitioner that, in the disclosure statement of Gursewak Singh @ Gabi who in clear terms stated in the statement dated 03.12.2023 that the petitioner has paid him Rs. 50,000/- on instructions of his father who was out of station at



that particular time for some work. These facts are not even disputed at the end of prosecution itself including the fact that Partap Singh on whose asking the petitioner has transacted the money to co-accused Gursewak Singh @ Gabi has been granted concession of bail by this Court.

5. Another aspect which cannot be loose sight of is that in the instant FIR, investigation is complete, challan stands presented to the Court and charges are yet to be framed and in as much as 23 prosecution witnesses have been listed, examination of whom will take sufficiently long time and on that account the petitioner who is just 19 years old cannot be permitted to be detained behind the bars for an indefinite period while his guilt is yet to be proved.

6. Even further, right to speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure guaranteed under Article 21. This constitutional right cannot be denied to the accused as is the mandate of the Apex court in “**Hussainara Khatoon and ors (IV) v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, Patna**”, (1980) 1 SCC 98; wherein it was held as under:

*“10. Directions given by this Court in Hussainara Khatoon (supra) to this effect were left to be implemented by the High Courts **Hussainara Khatoon and ors. (VII) etc. v. Home Secretary, Bihar and ors. etc. -(1995) 5 SCC 326 - para 2** are as follows :*

"2. Since this Court has already laid down the guidelines by orders passed from time to time in this writ petition and in subsequent orders passed in different cases since then, we do not consider it necessary to restate the guidelines periodically because the enforcement of the guidelines by the subordinate courts functioning in different States should now be the responsibility of the different High



Courts to which they are subordinate. General orders for release of undertrials without reference to specific fact-situations in different cases may prove to be hazardous. While there can be no doubt that undertrial prisoners should not languish in jails on account of refusal to enlarge them on bail for want of their capacity to furnish bail with monetary obligations, these are matters which have to be dealt with on case-to-case basis keeping in mind the guidelines laid down by this Court in the orders passed in this writ petition and in subsequent cases from time to time. Sympathy for the undertrials who are in jail for long terms on account of the pendency of cases has to be balanced having regard to the impact of crime, more particularly, serious crime, on society and these considerations have to be weighed having regard to the fact-situations in pending cases. While there can be no doubt that trials of those accused of crimes should be disposed of as early as possible, general orders in regard to judge strength of subordinate judiciary in each State must be attended to, and its functioning overseen, by the High Court of the State concerned. We share the sympathetic concern of the learned counsel for the petitioners that undertrials should not languish in jails for long spells merely on account of their inability to meet monetary obligations. We are, however, of the view that such monitoring can be done more effectively by the High Courts since it would be easy for that Court to collect and collate the statistical information in that behalf, apply the broad guidelines already issued and deal with the situation as it emerges from the status reports presented to it. The role of the High Court is to ensure that the guidelines issued by this Court are implemented in letter and spirit. We think it would suffice if we request the Chief Justices of the High Courts to undertake a review of such cases in their States and give appropriate directions where needed to ensure proper and effective implementation of the guidelines. Instead of repeating the general directions already issued, it would be sufficient to remind the High Courts to ensure expeditious disposal of cases...."

(emphasis added)



Moreover Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. The Apex Court in “*Abdul Rehman Antulay and others v. R.S. Nayak and another*”, 1992(2) RCR (Criminal) 634 observed that Right to Speedy Trial flowing from Article 21 encompasses all the stages, namely the stage of investigation, inquiry, trial, appeal, revision and retrial. And court also observed that the Right to Speedy Trial from the point of view of the accused are:

- I. The period of remand and pre-conviction detention should be as short as possible. In other words, the accused should not be subjected to unnecessary or unduly long incarceration prior to his conviction;
- II. The worry, anxiety, expense and disturbance to his vocation and peace, resulting from an unduly prolonged investigation, inquiry or trial should be minimal; and
- III. Undue delay may well result in impairment of the ability of the accused to defend himself, whether on account of death, disappearance or non-availability of witnesses or otherwise.

7. Admittedly, there is no recovery effected from the petitioner and he is not the one who has paid the money but only transacted on the asking of his father who has been granted bail.

8. In view of the aforesaid discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.



9. However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
10. Petition is allowed in above terms.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

11.07.2024
anuradha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>